




U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service


U

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536



File: WAC 98 134 50683 Office: California Service Center Date: JAN 24 2000

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



Petition: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

Public Copy

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

INSTRUCTIONS:


This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS


Terrance M. O'Reilly, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the director and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a non-profit religious organization which seeks to employ the beneficiary as a management consultant for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel argues that the proffered position is a specialty occupation and the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), provides in part for nonimmigrant classification to qualified aliens who are coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation. Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1184(i)(1), defines a "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

Pursuant to section 214(i)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1184(i)(2), to qualify as an alien coming to perform services in a specialty occupation the beneficiary must hold full state licensure to practice in the occupation, if such licensure is required to practice in the occupation. In addition, the beneficiary must have completed the degree required for the occupation, or have experience in the specialty equivalent to the completion of such degree and recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions relating to the specialty.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(B), the petitioner shall submit the following with an H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation:

1. A certification from the Secretary of Labor that the petitioner has filed a labor condition application with the Secretary,
2. A statement that it will comply with the terms of the labor condition application for the duration of the alien's authorized period of stay, and
3. Evidence that the alien qualifies to perform services in the specialty occupation.

The petitioner has provided a certified labor condition application and a statement that it will comply with the terms of the labor condition application.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C), to qualify to perform services in a specialty occupation, the alien must meet one of the following criteria:

1. Hold a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
2. Hold a foreign degree determined to be equivalent to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
3. Hold an unrestricted State license, registration, or certification which authorizes him or her to fully practice the specialty occupation and be immediately engaged in that specialty in the state of intended employment; or
4. Have education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience that is equivalent to completion of a United States baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty occupation and have recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions directly related to the specialty.

The petitioner asserts that the proffered position is that of a management consultant. The Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook), 1998-1999 edition, at page 67 indicates that the usual requirement for employment as a management consultant is a master's degree in business administration plus five years' experience in the field in which he or she hopes to consult.

The beneficiary's foreign education has been found by a credentials evaluation service to be equivalent to a baccalaureate degree in hotel and restaurant management. Accordingly, it is concluded that the petitioner has not shown that the beneficiary qualifies to perform the duties of a management consultant based upon education alone.

The beneficiary had three years' employment experience at the time the visa petition was filed. The petitioner has not shown that this experience was experience in a specialty occupation or that it is equivalent to a master's degree. The beneficiary is not a member of any organizations whose usual prerequisite for entry is a master's degree. In view of the foregoing, it is concluded that the

petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary qualifies to perform the duties of a management consultant.

The term "specialty occupation" is defined at 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as:

an occupation which requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge to fully perform the occupation in such fields of human endeavor, including, but not limited to, architecture, engineering, mathematics, physical sciences, social sciences, medicine and health, education, business specialties, accounting, law, theology, and the arts, and which requires the attainment of a bachelor's degree or higher in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), to qualify as a specialty occupation, the position must meet one of the following criteria:

1. A baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position;
2. The degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations or, in the alternative, an employer may show that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree;
3. The employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position; or
4. The nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

The duties of the proffered position are described in pertinent part as follows:

[The beneficiary] will deal mainly with consulting our management and other professionals with regard to our special services and activities ... Her duties will also entail defining the problems of our organization with regard to the curriculum we offer to the children and other services to the adults, who participate in our programs.

[The beneficiary] will work with the board of directors and committees to establish policies and programs and administer such programs. She will maintain relationships with other religious organizations in the community ... She will ... advise our management on alternative methods of solving problems or will recommend the implementation of new and modified systems for our programs ...

Furthermore, [the beneficiary] will analyze our organizational expenditures and employment administration. Additionally, [she] will perform duties, such as occasionally interviewing prospective participants and employees. She will make observations and analyze our operations ...

The foregoing description is insufficient to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. The duties are described in an abstract manner with no indication as to their actual level of complexity. There is little insight into the beneficiary's actual day-to-day duties.

The petitioner has failed to establish that any of the four factors enumerated above are present in this proceeding. The petitioner has not shown that it has, in the past, required the services of individuals with baccalaureate or higher degrees in a specialized area for the proffered position. In addition, the petitioner has not shown that similar firms require the services of such individuals in parallel positions. The petitioner has not explained why it requires the full-time services of a management consultant.

Counsel asserts that the Department of Labor has determined that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. A reference in the Department of Labor's Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT), Fourth Edition, 1977, standing alone, is not enough to establish an occupation is within the professions. The DOT classification system and its categorization of an occupation as "professional and kindred" are not directly related to membership in a profession as defined in immigration law. In the DOT listing of occupations, any given subject area within the professions contains nonprofessional work, as well as work within the professions.

The latest edition of the DOT does not give information about the educational and other requirements for the different occupations. This type of information is currently furnished by the Department of Labor in the various editions of the Handbook. The latter publication is given considerable weight (certainly much more than the DOT) in determining whether an occupation is within the professions. This is because it provides specific and detailed information regarding the educational and other requirements for occupations.

Counsel has cited several unpublished decisions of the Service. Service employees are not bound by unpublished decisions. In addition, counsel has not demonstrated that the facts and issues of those decisions are similar to those of this matter.

Counsel asserts the proposed position is a specialty occupation in view of the court ruling in Hong Kong T.V. Video Program, Inc. v. Ilchert, 685 F. Supp. 712 (N.D. Cal. 1988), which found a company president position professional based on the complexity of its duties alone even though a degree is not required. The Service does not consider itself bound by this decision outside the Northern District of California. In addition, Hong Kong is inapplicable here because it dealt narrowly with a company president with both extensive experience and significant authority over individuals.

In the court case, the beneficiary was the president of the largest Asian-language video distribution company in the United States, which under the beneficiary's guidance had achieved a gross annual income of approximately \$10 million within seven years of the company's founding. In addition, he had direct oversight over 70 employees and over 700 sublicensees, and his salary was \$140,000 per year. He was a corporate executive who made decisions at the senior management level of an extensive business operation. He was responsible for corporate strategy, budgeting, financial planning, marketing and promotional strategy, transportation and distribution of goods, product and inventory control, contractual negotiation and determination, and legal involvement with "pirate" firms involved in illegally duplicating and selling the company's products.

Unlike here, the beneficiary supervised managers who, in turn, had supervisors and assistants reporting to them. The supervisors and assistants, in turn, had employees such as foremen, blue-collar workers, secretaries, receptionists, clerks, and sales assistants reporting to them. The proposed position is not that of a company president. In addition, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary's duties will be as extensive and complex as those of the beneficiary in Hong Kong.

In these proceedings, the duties of the position are dispositive and not the job title. The proffered position appears to be primarily that of a general manager or executive. The Handbook, 1998-1999 edition, at pages 48-49 finds no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specialized area for employment as a general manager or executive. Degrees in business and in liberal arts fields appear equally welcome. In addition, certain personal qualities and participation in in-house training programs are often considered as important as a specific formal academic background. In view of the foregoing, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the proffered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of regulations.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden. Accordingly, the decision of the director will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.